

REMARKS:

Claims 1-5 and 10-20 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 15-17, and 20 are amended by this amendment. Claims 2 and 10 have been canceled by this amendment. New Claims 21-23 have been added by this amendment. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 USC § 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11-14, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 based on Dimberg (U.S. 1641745) in view of Havard et al. (U.S. 5483034). According to the Office Action, Dimberg teaches all aspects of the present invention except laser-welding the wall to the ring element from an opposite side of the ring element. However, according to the Office Action, Havard et al. teaches the missing element of laser-welding a wall element to an outer element from an opposite side of the outer element. Therefore, according to the Office Action, it would have been obvious to have used the laser-welding as taught by Havard et al. on the Dimberg invention. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

As currently amended, Independent Claim 1 requires several features not present in either Havard et al. or Dimberg. Claim 1 requires “a plurality of ... wall elements ... comprised of a plurality of blade walls.” Claim 1 further requires that at least two blade walls are laser-welded to a ring member. On the other hand, as can be seen in Fig. 4 of Dimberg and Fig. 2 of Havard et al., both of the cited documents only disclose wall elements that are comprised of a single component. The wall elements in Dimberg, described as “radiating blades 2” (Col. 1, lines 95-96), as can be seen in the figures, are single pieces arranged in parallel and attached to the ring (3 according to the Examiner) at one point (9 or 11). Likewise, the wall elements in Havard et al., described as “partitions 2” (Col. 2, line 47), are single components inserted between two plates to keep the plates at a predetermined distance (Col. 1, lines 24-25) and, also, are attached at one point. Since neither Dimberg nor Havard et al. disclose “a plurality of ... wall elements ... comprised of a plurality of blade walls” or laser welding at least two blade walls to a ring member, the combination of the two documents would still not disclose all of the features of the present invention as required in Claims 1.

Similarly, as currently amended, independent Claim 13 requires several features not present in either Havard et al. or Dimberg. Claim 13 requires “a plurality of ... struts ... comprised of a plurality of wall elements” and that at least two wall elements are laser-welded to a ring member. For at least similar reasons to those described above with respect to Claim 1, since neither Dimberg nor Havard et al. disclose “a plurality of ... struts ... comprised of a plurality of wall elements” or laser welding at least two wall elements to a ring member, the combination of the two documents would still not disclose all of the features of the present invention as required in Claims 13.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1 and 13 and allowance of these Claims. Furthermore, since Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 14 and 18-20 depend from Claim 13, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of these Claims for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 3-5 and 10, all of which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 15-17, all of which depend from Claim 13, were rejected under 35 USC §103 based on Dimberg in view of Harvard et al. and in further view of Doran (U.S. 2347034). According to the Office Action, Dimberg and Havard et al. disclose the invention, as summarized above, with the exception of a plurality of ring elements being joined together to form a ring and a hollow blade. The Examiner contends that Doran discloses a plurality of ring elements as well as a hollow blade. However, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these Claims and allowance of these Claims for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claims 1 and 13.

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.156.PCUS00.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5300
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 571-3400
(713) 456-2836 (fax)
tracy.druce@novakdruce.com

Respectfully submitted,



Tracy W. Druce, Esq.
Reg. No. 35,493